

### **REMARKS**

The above amendments are made in response to the Office action of October 20, 2006. The Examiner's reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 12 can be found at least in FIG. 2 and page 6, lines 2-30 of the specification. Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application for further consideration. No new matter has been added, amendments have been made for purposes of clarifying the claimed invention.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

In order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine v. Barient, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). Moreover, the single source must disclose all of the claimed elements "arranged as in the claim." *Structural Rubber Prods. Co. v. Park Rubber Co.*, 749 F.2d 707, 716, 223 U.S.P.Q. 1264, 1274 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Missing elements may not be supplied by the knowledge of one skilled in the art or the disclosure of another reference. *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 780, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773, 777 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

#### **Claims 1-6 and 8-11**

Claims 1-6 and 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Yoo (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,101, hereinafter "Yoo"). The Examiner states that Yoo discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims, primarily in FIG. 2, column 5 lines 23-60 and column 8 lines 30-40. Applicant respectfully traverses at least for the reasons set forth below.

It is respectfully submitted that Yoo discloses a clock signal detecting unit outputting a first or a second level of a clock detecting signal depending on the TMDS clock signal, a controller outputting a first-level of a power-saving signal when the first level clock detecting signal is input, and outputting a second level of power-saving signal when the second level clock detecting signal is input, and a power supply unit supplying

a voltage to respective components, and cutting off the supply of the voltage to respective components depending on the level of the power-saving signal or the clock detecting signal. (Emphasis added.) (See Abstract.) Thus, Yoo merely discloses two modes of power consumption and does not disclose the DPMS standard which differentiates between four modes by determining whether either one of or both of horizontal and vertical synchronization signals are input from an outside, as recited in amended claims 1 and 12 and explicated on page 6, lines 8-30 of the specification as originally filed. Furthermore, Yoo does not disclose that a timing controller is controlled by determining whether either one of or both of horizontal and vertical synchronization signals are input from an outside, as recited in amended claims 1 and 12. More specifically, Yoo does not teach or suggest a determination unit for determining whether either one of or both of the horizontal and vertical synchronization signals are input from the outside, and controlling the switching unit and the timing controller, and performing a normal mode or power saving mode depending upon determination results, as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 12. Thus claims 1 and 12, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2-11 and 13-26, define over Yoo for at least the above reasons.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above rejection to claims 1-6 and 8-11 under § 102(e) and respectfully requests allowance of claims 1-26.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

***Claims 7 and 12-26***

Claims 7 and 12-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Yoo in view of Nakano, Takao (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0020677, hereinafter "Nakano"). Applicant respectfully traverses at least for the reasons set forth below.

The Examiner states that Yoo discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims except, *a backlight having a light source*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed in FIG. 1, paragraphs 48 and 52 of Nakano.

It is respectfully noted that claims 7, 23 and 26 depend from independent claim 1 and claims 13-22 and 24-26 depend from independent claim 12, both of which independent claims are submitted as being allowable for defining over Yoo as discussed above. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that use of the backlight of Nakano, or any other teaching of Nakano, does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Yoo.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above rejection to claims 7 and 12-26 under § 103(a) and respectfully requests allowance of claims 1-26.

**Conclusion**

In light of the above remarks, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections. If there are any charges due with respect to this response, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' Attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By /James J. Merrick/  
James J. Merrick  
Registration No. 43,801  
Confirmation No. 1909  
Cantor Colburn LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone: (860) 286-2929  
Fax: (860) 286-0115

Date: January 19, 2007